



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,404	07/05/2001	Hisao Furukawa	B-4235 618927-6	3517

7590

11/03/2004

Richard P. Berg, Esq.
c/o LADAS & PARRY
Suite 2100
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

LIEN, TAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/899,404	Applicant(s) FURUKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Tan Lien	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Feb. 6, 2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTIONS

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 2000-211451, filed on 07/12/2000.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: There are no line numbers in the disclosure so the Examiner can refer to the exact location of the errors.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

In FIG. 1, the AE should be AC in the figure. It does not have a reference number so the Examiner cannot point to exactly where it is, but it is obvious in FIG. 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(a) This independent claim does not appear to have a preamble or if it does, the Examiner cannot determine where the preamble ends. Does the preamble end in "An integrated information communication system comprising" or "a packet transfer function; wherein:"? Where does the body of the claim starts? The Examiner does not know what elements in the claim should be given weight to.

(b) The limitation "in such a case that a request identification of said conversion table implies a virtual dedicated line" on page 108, last section, does not clarify what the scope of the limitation is. Does the Applicant intend to mean "if the request identification field of the conversion table is a value indicating a virtual dedicated line?" We know that the access control apparatus checks the request identification of the conversion table to indicate the type of transmission when the external packet is about to enter the internal network. But what does it functionally do once it is request identification is determined? Does the access control apparatus direct the external

packet to a virtual dedicated internal line once it is indicated in the request identification field?

(c) The limitation "external packet is inputted is registered as a record of said conversion table" is unclear. What does it mean when "an external packet is inputted is registered?" Is the external packet entering the internal network? Is the external packet registering its identification information or is there another server checking the external packet before registering the external packet identification information?

(d) The whole limitation "in such a case that said request identification information implies a private address communication, a set ... installed on the transmission side;" is unclear as to what it is trying to do. The Examiner suggest that claim be rewritten so that it is in a list or outline format so that it is clear instead of trying to put everything into one single paragraph. For example: if the request identification "implies" a private address communication, then (1) input a set of identification information of a logic terminal... into conversion table, (2) do B, (3) do C, and if C then or in case the address is determined, then

(C1) determine A

(C2) determine B...

(e) The limitation "is made different from each other every record" is not clear grammatically. Does the applicant mean "is made different from each and every other record" or something else?

(f) Please clarify the claim and rewrite it so that the scope of the claim is unaltered. It may be in a condition for allowance if it is clarified and all the limitations are addressed and clear.

(g) Dependent claim 3 is also rejected by virtue of its dependency.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(a) The limitations in this claim seem to be similar to claim 1. It is just a different embodiment of claim 1. Please also clarify this claim. It may be in a condition for allowance if it is clear and all the limitations are addressed.

(b) All other dependent claims (9 and 13) are rejected by virtue of its dependencies.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(a) It is unconventional as to how the applicant is using the term "wherein" and "comprising" in this claim. Usually a system comprises components wherein the components perform functions of a unique invention or a method of a system performing functions of a unique invention. Rarely does the Examiner see an independent claim that starts with a preamble with "An integrated information

communication system, wherein:", rather, it should be "An integrated information communication system, comprising:" and a list of system components wherein the components perform tasks.

(b) The limitation "only when a set of three addresses of an originating internal address ... said external packet is converted into said internal packet" is unclear as to what it is trying to do and how does it fit into the invention. It is also unclear what is meant by "inputted external packet" and the Examiner thinks the Applicant means "entered external packet." A packet can enter an internal network but does not "input" into an internal network.

(c) Claims 5-8, 10-12, and 14-16 are also rejected by virtue of their dependencies. If the Applicant combines claim 4 and its dependencies, the claim as a whole may be allowable, if the combination of the claims are clear and the scope of the claims are unaltered.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation "said conversion table is two or more, group..." is grammatically unclear. What is expected after the two or more? Also, "an external a destination address" is unclear. The Examiner thinks that "an external destination address" is meant in this instance.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 9 and 10 recite the limitation "upper-grade protocol" in second line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 18-22, the limitations "transmitting permission" and "receiving permission" are unclear as to what they mean. It will be construed to mean "permission to transmit" and "permission to receive" data.

In claims 20 and 21, the limitation "charging" lacks antecedent basis and does not have a clear explanation in the disclosure. The Examiner will construe the meaning of charging to mean the accounting cost of the network resource usage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mayes et al (US Patent 5,793,763).

Claim(s) 17: Mayes teaches an IP network, wherein said IP network has

access control apparatus, said access control apparatus includes a conversion table which controls conversions from an external packet to an internal packet and from the internal packet to the external packet, said conversion table includes plural records, a terminal address at a destination side is registered as an external destination address item in the record, and only when a destination address is non-private address, the internal packet is transferred in said IP network by regarding the external packet as the internal packet (Abstract of Mayes and FIG. 2; The Translation System is the access control apparatus that includes a conversion table for converting address from local addresses to global addresses and vice versa, and only when the destination address is local address, the packet from the Internet is regarded as local packet).

Claim(s) 18: Mayes teaches an IP network, wherein said IP network has

access control apparatus, said access control apparatus includes a conversion table which controls conversions from an external packet to an internal packet and from the internal packet to the external packet, said conversion table includes plural records, and transmitting permission of the internal packet is decided by designating any one of source transmitting permission and destination transmitting permission in the record (Abstract and FIG. 2 & 5; The permission to transmit or receive is done by the translation system for security purposes {FIG. 5, ref. 218, 224 & 226}).

Claim(s) 19: Mayes teaches an IP network, wherein said IP network has access control apparatus, said access control apparatus includes a conversion table which controls conversions from an external packet to an internal packet and from the internal packet to the external packet, said conversion table includes plural records, and receiving permission of the designating internal packet is decided by source receiving permission in the record (Abstract and FIG. 2 & 7; The permission to receive data from the source {source receiving permission} is determined at the address translation system in FIG. 2 before entering the local enterprise network).

Claim(s) 22: Mayes teaches an access control apparatus, wherein said access control apparatus connects terminals each other via a communication line and includes a conversion table which controls conversions from an external packet to an internal packet and from the internal packet to the external packet, said conversion table includes plural records, transmitting permission of the internal packet is decided by designating any one of source transmitting permission and destination transmitting permission in the record, or receiving permission of the internal packet is decided by designating source receiving permission in the record (Abstract and FIG. 2 & 5; The access apparatus is the Translation System in FIG. 2, and the permission to transmit

data from the source {source receiving permission} is determined at the address translation system in FIG. 2 before entering the local enterprise network).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayes as applied to claims 18 and 19 above, and further in view of Bruins et al (US Patent 6,308,148).

Claim(s) 20: Mayes teaches an IP network as claimed in Claim 18, but fail to teach

“charging of said IP network is carried out by designating any one of the source transmitting permission and the destination transmitting permission in the record,” which the Examiner has construed the meaning of “charging for network resource usage.”

Bruins, in an analogous art, teaches filtering and aggregating traffic flow based on source and destination addresses (col. 2, lines 15-45) so that management application system can display and charge the user for their network usage (col. 7, lines 43-47). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2141

the invention to combine Mayes' IP network to include Bruins' the accounting cost of network usage, for the advantage of monitoring the efficient usage of the network (col. 2, lines 6-14 Bruins).

Claim(s) 21: Mayes teaches an IP network as claimed in Claim 19, but fail to teach "charging of said IP network is carried out by designating the source receiving permission in the record" which the Examiner has construed the meaning of "charging for network resource usage."

Bruins, in an analogous art, teaches filtering and aggregating traffic flow based on source and destination addresses (col. 2, lines 15-45) so that management application system can display and charge the user for their network usage (col. 7, lines 43-47). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayes' IP network to include Bruins' the accounting cost of network usage, for the advantage of monitoring the efficient usage of the network (col. 2, lines 6-14 Bruins).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tan Lien whose telephone number is (703) 305-6018/ (571) 272-3883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 6pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003/ (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [tan.lien@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER